



George Weber  
<gw@gwenvironmental.com>

06/29/2005 05:22 PM

Tonya Hope <rcockrell@nedenverhousing.org>, Wendy Hawthorne <whawthorne@nedenverhousing.org>, Glenn Tucker <gjt1@cdc.gov>, Dawn Tesorero/ENF/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, "Tafoya-Dominguez, Beverly - Environmental Health" <Beverly.Tafoya-Dominguez@ci.denver.co.us>, "Salas, Jason S - Environmental Health" <Jason.Salas@ci.denver.co.us>, Richard Lotz <richard.lotz@state.co.us>, Wendy OBrien/EPR/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Michelle Smith <msmith@projectresourcesinc.com>, Michael Kosnett <Michael.Kosnett@uchsc.edu>, Beverly Lumumba <lumumbaphd@yahoo.com>, Lorraine Granado <lorrgranado@yahoo.com>, "Little, Bob" <BLittle@ASARCO.com>, Victor Ketellapper/EPR/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Karen Kellen/ENF/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Jim and Karen Halberg Weaver <halbergweaver@members.mkl-mmef.org>, Jennifer Chergo/OCP/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, "Hoff, Martha F - Environmental Health" <Martha.Hoff@ci.denver.co.us>, Gloria Shearer % Steve Reemts <stmartinplaza@qwest.net>, George Weber <gw@gwenvironmental.com>, Gene Hook <gene.hook@ci.denver.co.us>, DouglasKay@aol.com, Derek Boer <derek.boer@state.co.us>, Patricia Courtney/OCP/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Celia Vanderloop <Celia.Vanderloop@ci.denver.co.us>, "Barbara O'Grady" <barbara.ograde@state.co.us>, "Arend, Chris" <Chris.Arend@mail.house.gov>, Anthony Thomas <anthomas@juno.com>, Jessica Sewell <jessica.sewell@mail.house.gov>, Kenneth Cotton/ENF/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Jane Mitchell <jane.mitchell@state.co.us>, James Chapman <james.chapman@ci.denver.co.us>, Chris Poulet/RA/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Raquel Holguin <rhloguin8@yahoo.com>, Amy Jones <amy3995@yahoo.com>, Margaret Schonbeck <margaret.schonbeck@state.co.us>

cc

bcc

Subject

Please find the attached final minutes for the 5-19-05 Working Group meeting. I have integrated the 'action items' from the addendum to the draft, and there are a couple of small changes. No revisions have been made to the participant sheet I sent you with the draft minutes.

**The next Working Group meeting scheduled 9:00 am - 12:00 pm, Thursday, 7/14/05 will be held at the New Hope Baptist Church, Overflow Room, at 3701 Colorado Blvd. I have attached a map of the location.**

George Weber, Inc.  
Environmental Policy Analysis, Planning, & Management  
303/494-8572  
[gw@gwenvironmental.com](mailto:gw@gwenvironmental.com)



[www.gwenvironmental.com](http://www.gwenvironmental.com) location for 7-14-05 W/king Grp Meeting.gif Vasquez Blvd-I70 FINAL 5-19-05 Meeting Notes 1.pdf

**FINAL (6-29-05)  
Vasquez I-70 Working Group  
Meeting Notes**

**May 19, 2005  
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.  
Swansea Recreation Center  
2650 East 49th Avenue  
Denver, CO 80216**

**ATTENDING**

**Meeting Participants:** Please see attachment.

**Facilitator:** George Weber, George Weber Inc. Environmental

**Recorder:** Pat Courtney, Jennifer Chergo, Region VIII EPA, Community Relations

**BACKGROUND AND MEETING OBJECTIVES**

Meeting called by: Vasquez I-70 Working Group

Type of meeting: Reporting, presenting, Q&A, feedback, discussion, planning, decision-making – depending on the issue.

Distributed for participants to read prior to meeting: None

**Desired Outcomes:**

- Participants receive a progress report and provide feedback in re soil clean-up, external lead based paint abatement activities, under Superfund, and CHP activities.
- Participants develop an action plan for helping EPA obtain access for sampling.
- Participants are informed about the sampling protocol used for VB-I70 and alternatives, and their concerns about 'hotspots' addressed and alleviated.
- Participants support decision of Community Involvement-CHP Subcommittee to rotate location of Working Group meetings through each VB-I70 site neighborhood.

The meeting notes below primarily reflect the notes Jennifer Chergo took, supplemented by those Pat Courtney wrote on the easel paper during the meeting and by notes George Weber took during the meeting.

## **1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

George Weber began by:

- Asking each meeting participant to introduce themselves to the group.
- Asking if everyone had received notes for the 3-31-05 Working Group meeting and if anyone had questions.

## **2. COMMUNITY HEALTH PROGRAM: PROGRESS REPORT AND Q&A**

Martha Hoff distributed a handout describing recent Community Health Program Partnership Activities that included minutes from the newly-formed Community Health Program subcommittee and Outreach Development Group meetings, as well as, the recent Steering Committee minutes.

Martha explained that at the last Working Group meeting there was discussion about a need for more community involvement in the Community Health Program. She explained that as a result, a new subcommittee was formed, the Community Health Program subcommittee (CHP-SC). The CHP-SC meets monthly and focuses on day-to-day activities. The CHP-SC is a forum for the CHP staff and workers, and EPA and CDPHE Community Relations staff and community leaders to “put their heads together” to work through issues that arise as the CHP develops. The CHP-SC also provides a forum for Martha to inform participants about Steering Committee activities and to obtain community participants’ concerns and questions about these for communication back to the Steering Committee.

Martha also told the Working Group members that another group – the Outreach Development Group (ODG) – has been formed. The ODG provides a forum for community leaders to contribute to the development of the documents that Community Health Workers (CHW) distribute to Site residents.

Jay Salas told the group that the CHWs have made 1,000 contacts and completed 600 home visits. Home visits may require 3 to 4 face-to-face visits, and may last up to one hour each. A home visit can be very intensive. In addition, CHWs have obtained 30 new signed access agreements from Site residents. In addition, he noted that the CHWs have identified 50 properties that were not on EPA’s original list. Some of these are new construction.

Jay said that the CHP is hiring 6 new CHWs. The new hires have received notice of the new positions from CHWs and flyers posted in the community. Jay asked Working Group participants for nominations. In addition, Jay and Martha will provide a flyer to each Working Group participant via email and will deliver a hard copy to Joan Hooker’s residence.

Anthony Thomas suggested putting a flyer in Elbra Wedgeworth’s office.

Martha noted that they can connect anyone interested in a position with a currently employed CHW in order to obtain first-hand information about the job.

Jay also asked the Working Group participants to inform him of any neighborhood events, noting that CHWs who live or are working in a particular neighborhood can go to events in this community.

Martha stated that they are in the process of getting the small grants process going so that they can partner with community groups.

Victor asked when the training for the new CHWs will be.

Jay replied it would happen in the next few weeks.

Martha added that they cannot be paid for at least six weeks so they may be hired in the next few weeks but won’t actually start until sometime after that.

The next CHP-SC meeting will be on June 16 at either Swansea Recreation Center or St. Martin's Plaza in Cole.

Michael Kosnett asked if people are getting information on who can do lead abatement for them.

Martha replied that they are referred to Northeast Denver Housing.

Kosnett said that they should check with NEDH as to where they then refer people. His concern was that people get lead –based paint information and that it is specific and appropriate.

Martha said that the CHP is funding 100 properties to be assessed, so referral to NEDH means a chance to have an assessment done by NEDH lead investigators.

Tonya Hope explained to the group what NEDH lead investigators examine.

Victor clarified that under this grant, the CHP workers don't look at soil – just inside the house.

Martha asked Tonya if NEDH had a specialist to interpret assessment results.

Tonya replied that they have a specialist who evaluates if a result exceeds the HUD hazard threshold and provides information identifying abatement contractors and on how to handle lead based paint.

The group discussed lead based paint and how a resident can contain it by keeping it wet, but that having a contractor deal with it is best.

Jay noted that CHWs provide considerable lead paint information, including the NEDH telephone number.

Martha noted that NEDH also has clean up kits to stabilize lead that they take into homes.

Kosnett said that that all of this information was reassuring.

Beverly Tafoya-Dominguez added that CHP Workers also provide a referral to DURA.

Jay noted that he gets a lot of calls from people, especially about windows.

Martha said that each of the NEDH and DURA materials are one page flyers that are easy to find and that CHWs can provide these. She also noted that the new CHW will be trained in the field.

**Action Items:**

- ❖ Refer potential candidates for Community Health Worker positions to Jay Salas.
- ❖ Inform Jay Salas and Martha Hoff of community organization meetings and events.
- ❖ Next CHP-SC meeting scheduled for 6-16-05. Jennifer will notify attendees of location.
- ❖ EPA will inform Working Group participants of time, date, location, and agenda for lead abatement training.
- ❖ CHP will send out a informing Working Group participants of date, time, and location of training for new CHWs.

**3. IMPROVING COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION & INVOLVEMENT BY ROTATING WORKING GROUP MEETING LOCATIONS THROUGH VB-70 NEIGHBORHOODS: UPDATE, DECISION-MAKING, AND ACTION PLAN**

George Weber explained that at the last Working Group and 4/7/05 sub-group meetings, participants achieved consensus on the decision to rotate Working Group meetings through Site neighborhoods.

Participants in today's meeting endorsed the decision.

George said that Joan Hooker and Beverly Lumumba have been looking to find a site in Clayton.

Joan Hooker told the group that she thought it was important to move the meetings around so that the people who wanted to be involved can be.

Victor said that one concern is that it gets confusing moving meetings to different locations each time, so that a new location should be announced well in advance of a meeting.

Tonya said that she would go back to the Cole Neighborhood Alliance and see if there is anywhere in Cole to have meetings.

Anthony reminded everyone that meeting facilities should meet Americans With Disabilities Act standards.

**Action Items:**

- ❖ Rotate Working Group meetings through various Site communities.
- ❖ Joan and George will investigate the suitability of New Hope Baptist Church.
- ❖ Meeting facility must meet ADA standards.
- ❖ Tonya will identify and nominate to George potential meeting sites in Cole.

**4. SOILS CLEAN-UP: PROGRESS REPORT, EPA'S NEEDS FOR COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING ACCESS FOR SAMPLING, AND Q&A**

Victor Ketellapper said that the soil removal crews are continuing work and that the group had an opportunity to see them at work, as a couple of properties nearby were having the soil removed and replaced. He encouraged meeting attendees to drive by and have a look as they leave the meeting.

Victor said that the big push now is getting access agreements from those property owners who have not yet granted EPA access for either soil sampling or cleanup. The targets are homeowners and landlords at properties that need to have soil sampled or have had their soil sampled and need a cleanup. He told the group that EPA can be tougher in dealing with landlords. EPA has sent landlords a strongly-worded letter using certified mail. He wanted the community leaders especially to know about this in case they hear from anyone about these letters.

Jennifer Chergo explained the basic approach that EPA and the community leaders from each neighborhood are taking to contact the remaining property owners who have not signed access agreements. Jennifer stated that the community leaders may attend an informational meeting, then, will contact residents in their neighborhoods where access agreements need to be obtained. EPA will provide payment for each contact made or attempted.

Jay Salas offered that CHWs can provide helpful advice regarding the type of resistance and issues these community leaders could expect.

Silvia Gonzales agreed to attend the informational meeting, if necessary.

Jay also said that the issue of access could be discussed at one of the Friday meetings.

Meeting participants had a short, general discussion about reasons why some residents are resisting participating in the cleanup.

Martha Hoff said that she could provide Jennifer a weekly update of access agreements CHWs have obtained.

Jay added that it would be good to coordinate efforts.

Victor said that there are 14 addresses where people have refused access to have their properties cleaned up. He said there may be a chance that the community leaders would know these folks and could help there too.

Ken Cotton asked if EPA could provide the letter that was sent to landlords to Martha so that the ODG could review it.

Gene Hook cautioned EPA in using City Assessor's Office data for contacting landlords, as the address field in the database does not always contain current data.

Victor said that EPA is constantly updating the list.

Jay suggested that community leaders and CHWs involved in contacting residents about access have an on-going forum for discussing issues that arise.

Lorraine Granado stated that this is not what she agreed to do and that she would not be interested in participating in that kind of forum.

**Action Items:**

- ❖ Silvia will brief EPA and community leaders on potential issues they may encounter in their efforts to obtain access agreements.
- ❖ EPA and CHP will inform one another of access agreements each has obtained on a weekly basis.
- ❖ Working Group agreed that EPA can work bilaterally with various community leaders and organizations in attempting to obtain access agreements.
- ❖ EPA, Victor, will provide a copy of the letter EPA sent to owners of residences where access agreements are necessary still.

**5. EXTERIOR LEAD BASED PAINT ABATEMENT: PROGRESS REPORT & Q&A**

Lorraine asked if we can "go inside" and deal with interior lead-based paint.

Victor said that there is funding in the Community Health Program to deal with that. He also noted that the assessment companies for external lead-based paint will be hired in the next two weeks. He asked the group to defer discussing the external lead-based paint abatement protocol until the next Working Group meeting. He said that the pre-bid conference for external lead paint abatement would be held soon, and that EPA is developing training requirements. Once these are developed, he said he would provide these to community leaders and ask for their help recruiting locals to do the abatement.

Lorraine said that she was happy that EPA will be recruiting youth and adults from the Site to do the abatement work and that she would like to see this attempted before EPA recruits from outside the Site.

Tonya asked if minority companies would be considered.

Michael Kosnett asked if EPA has a plan to go back to all of the homes that have been painted improperly after the soil was replaced.

Victor said that he will recommend that the external lead paint assessors ask people this question.

Michael asked if EPA is telling people to hold off on painting, and if not, to do it properly.

Victor said that he and Jennifer were working to put that on the construction completion letters.

Jennifer said that it has not been done yet, however.

Michael asked what EPA was going to tell people if they have repainted their homes and it has impaired the remedy.

Victor replied that this most likely occurred only in a few instances and that EPA would cleanup any recontamination.

Martha said the CHWs could highlight this in their conversations with people because "a letter is one thing, but a conversation is another".

Amy Jones said that the community is actually aware of the external paint issue and said the PRI crew receives a lot of calls, especially after someone sent information about external lead based paint to homes after they were cleaned up.

Michael emphasized that the issue should be communicated very clearly.

**Action Items:**

- ❖ Discussion of method to be used for evaluating eligibility for external lead based paint abatement will be postponed until 7-14-05 Working Group meeting when Victor anticipates having EPA Headquarters decision.
- ❖ EPA will contract with two organizations to conduct external lead based paint assessments within the next two weeks.
- ❖ EPA will try to develop scholarships for Site residents and businesses for training and certification.
- ❖ EPA, in cooperation with NEDHC will try to connect trainees with certified personnel and businesses.
- ❖ EPA will conduct pre-bid conference within the next 3-4 weeks.
- ❖ EPA will add the following question to the evaluation form: 'Have you painted since the soil has been removed and replaced from your yard.'
- ❖ EPA will update completion letter and warn households whose soil has been remediated not to repaint their homes before the external lead based paint assessment has been conducted.
- ❖ If a household has repainted their home since soil was replaced, EPA will retest the soil and replace it if it has become contaminated.



## 6. 'HOTSPOTS': PRESENTATION AND Q&A

Wendy O'Brien said that she reviewed the site documents and talked to folks who were involved when the EPA sampling protocol was developed. She noted that many of those same folks were in the room and that they should feel free to jump in whenever they like. She said that, though she was looking at this from hindsight and was not involved in the site at the time, it looked to her that the work accounted for hotspots contaminated with arsenic, but not lead. She said that the primary reason for this was because at that time and based on EPA's investigation, arsenic was thought to be the bigger threat.

Wendy said that the EPA sampling plan is useful for yard wide averages over the long term. She said that EPA can improve its communications advising those in older homes to take precautions regarding external lead-based paint. She also noted that the Community Health Program can help inform people.

Lorraine asked if we ever captured lead hotspots.

Wendy replied that, based on the risk assessment, we did not.

Anthony Thomas said that he was lead to believe that all hotspots would be identified.

Michael Kosnett explained that the EPA protocol used a method of taking 30 samples divided into 3 groups of 10. He said they looked at the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile confidence level on the mean. He said that this was done for arsenic in particular because the concern was with arsenic. He said the method did not ignore lead hotspots, but that the analysis was based on arsenic.

Lorraine asked if, in that case, hot spots from exterior lead-based paint would not have been identified.

Wendy replied that they would not have been identified.

Wendy then gave a short presentation on the differences between probabilistic and non-probabilistic sampling methods, in order to explain the difference between EPA's and HUD's sampling protocols.

Gene Hook, Michael Kosnett, and Jennifer Chergo all agreed that EPA could communicate this issue to people more clearly so that they are not under the impression that there are no hot spots if their soil does not require a cleanup.

Akwe Starnes asked about hotspots in garden areas.

Jane Mitchell said that it was possible, but probably a low risk because garden amendments and compost are usually added to gardens. Also, exposure through vegetables probably is also a low risk compared to exposure through direct ingestion of soil.

Participants discussed exposure to lead and arsenic, hotspots, and garden vegetables.

Martha Hoff asked the group if the content of Wendy's email should be developed into a flyer.

Jennifer said that if the group develops a short message there are lots of places to put it – results letters, CHWs' materials, etc.

Gloria Scherer was concerned that some information in the Cole newsletter was misleading.

Tonya replied that she is the editor of the newsletter and that she will try to explain the difference between EPA and NEDH testing processes and also the different roles of all the agencies in the lead paint effort.

Joan Hooker asked what she should tell residents if there is a hotspot in their yard.

Wendy said that first she would need to know how that resident learned they have a hotspot.

Jennifer added that she could tell anyone concerned that all they have to do is eliminate exposure by covering the hot spot.

James Chapman wanted to know if a hotspot is identified, does EPA look at the source to develop a solution.

Members of the group answered that we are mainly talking about lead hotspots for which the most likely source is paint.

Lorraine and Victor noted that lead paint information is provided to residents.

**Action Items:**

- ❖ EPA and CHP will revise their materials with the intent of educating households whose soils did not exceed the threshold enabling them to be removed and replaced of the potential for 'hot spots' of contamination, i.e., so that these residents do not develop a false sense of security.
- ❖ CHP needs to know NOW regarding the message it needs to communicate to the community, as they are now drafting material for community review.
- ❖ NEDHC will place an article explaining the two different programs in northeast Denver testing for lead and arsenic in their newsletter.

**7. SOURCE – NEW ISSUE RAISED BEFORE MEETING ADJOURNMENT**

Though not on the agenda, Lorraine Granado raise the issue of 'source'. She said that she was concerned because she had heard that arsenic trioxide is the result of smelting and she feels that she was never told this before. She said they got "jerked around" with an explanation that arsenic trioxide must be PAX. She also said that she wanted to see the Drexler study and asked why EPA has never released it.

Wendy O'Brien noted that she presented information addressing source, arsenic trioxide, smelting, and data from the Drexler report a few years ago.

Michael Kosnett concurred that he was at that meeting.

Victor Ketellapper said that EPA currently is reviewing the report to see if the agency can release it. He agreed that there could be a meeting devoted to this issue once this determination is made.

Participants discussed the Drexler Report and source issues.

**Action Items:**

- ❖ Karen Kellen, EPA, will review the Drexler study and associated documents and decide if and how to release these to the public.

**8. CLOSURE – NEXT STEPS – NEXT MEETING?**

George Weber asked the group when the next Working Group meeting should occur. Participants agreed on 9:00 am – 12:00 pm, Thursday, July 14, 2005. He informed the group that he would notify them of the meeting location after he examined alternative facilities suggested by leaders from the Clayton neighborhood.

Participants then adjourned the meeting.

**UPDATE: NEXT WORKING GROUP MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM, THURSDAY, 7/14/05 AT THE NEW HOPE BAPTIST CHURCH, OVERFLOW ROOM, AT 3701 COLORADO BLVD. I HAVE ATTACHED A MAP OF THE LOCATION.**